

THE FACULTY UNION BULLETIN

Published by the UCR Local (No. 1966) of The United Professors of California (American Federation of Teachers)

Vol. I, No. 3

THE BULLETIN

The Bulletin, which is distributed to all faculty and library staff members, invites you to use it to share your thoughts with your colleagues. Send contributions to Roger Pierce, Theatre Department.

UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS

State College Budget

Before very long, the *Bulletin* will be presenting an extended discussion on Governor Reagan's new budget. The University will receive less money and more students than it received last year and, once again, we will be without a salary increase despite the increasing cost of living. As a kind of appetizer for the news to come, here is a summary of the governor's plans for the State Colleges:

Where the State College Trustees had requested a 13 percent salary increase plus six percent for fringe benefits, the Governor's budget provides for no increase. Of 1,300 faculty positions requested by the Trustees, the State College receive zero. Despite an expected 22,065 additional students next year, the State College budget is only 1.7 percent higher than it was last year, representing a 13 percent cut in cost per student if inflation is considered. The Economic Opportunity Program budget goes from \$4.1 million to \$1.1 million. The library budget is cut by three million dollars. The Master of Social Work programs at four State Colleges are cut by half a million dollars, reducing the number of entering students by 50 percent. Funds for recruiting new faculty (half a million) are eliminated. Not a single dollar is to be given for new campuses or new buildings.

State College faculties will be expected to work harder for less pay. Tens of thousands of qualified students will be denied a college education, and it is likely that those who receive such an education will have to pay tuition. Would this have been possible with collective bargaining and strong faculty organization?

Alan Beals

☆☆☆

The Russian Department

Recently the UCR community was shocked to hear that the appointment of Messrs. Levine and Forostenko are being terminated and that the Russian major would be no more. We were further led to understand that a third position would be jeopardized by the decision, since the absence of a Russian major would render extraneous anything more than a token offering in Russian.

Not only were we electrified at the suddenness of the move; doubly unnerving was the fact that this decision was reached unilaterally by the Administration without prior consultation, either with the Russian staff, the chairman of the department, or with any committee of the Academic Senate, the body whose only remaining prerogatives lie in the area of courses and curricula.

The reasons for this hatchet job are two: enrollments in Russian have dropped considerably since language is no longer required for graduation in the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences and the other colleges have relaxed their language requirements; and secondly, the budgetary situation for the University as a whole is so grim as to require cutbacks in expenditures for the coming year.

Were one to confine his thinking purely to the calculus of FTE, student-faculty ratios and the other shibboleths of administrators, this move against the Russians would be perfectly understandable and justifiable. But let me suggest that anyone who does so confine himself has lost his grip on what the university is, or at least what it ought to be.

From another perspective, several queries and observations come to mind.

1. Why is it that when cutbacks are mentioned, the necks of faculty are immediately laid on the block? The number of administrators on the Riverside campus has more than doubled since Ivan Hinderaker assumed the chancellorship. This growth has been in part a response to the growing student body and the accompanying complexity of UCR. In part, however, it was also a preparatory increase, based upon the Chancellor's multi-college plan, itself predicated upon the growth of Riverside to a 27,500-student general campus of the university system.

We now know that UCR is destined to reach about one third the size specified by the Kerr Master Plan. So the question is, why not cut back on the number of administrators, either by returning them to faculty status or by discharging them entirely?

Even were the Kerr plan still to remain in effect, the prior relocation or discharge of administrators would be preferable to the discharge of teachers. Teachers and students constitute a university. Over the years, administrators have insinuated themselves into the fundamental constituency, but this is a matter of propaganda rather than fact. Administrators were appointed initially to take care of routine matters which faculty were once expected to handle as part of their duties, but which were time-consuming. That is, administrators were originally appointed to free teachers to teach (and in some cases to control teachers as paid hirelings of boards of trustees). At their best they were like a number of other time-saving devices: secretaries, typewriters, Xerox machines - convenient but expendable.

(Russian cont'd)

Unfortunately, the faculty — sedulously encouraged by administrators — found it expedient to leave more and more to the administrators. In a time of growth and expansion, the dangers of this attitude were not apparent. But in effect what happened was that all of the effective power once in the hands of the faculty quietly passed to the administration. Once they had the power, the administrators began — naturally enough — to assume that they, rather than the students and faculty, were the fundamental constituent elements of the university. If effective power be the determining factor in defining the essential constituency of an institution, then administrators and the Regents are certainly correct: they are the university.

The absurdity of this conclusion, however, is obvious. Simply perform the imaginative test of taking either the students or faculty away from the university. What remains in either case is a group of buildings, and a group of administrators with nothing recognizable to administrate. On the other hand, if you subtract both buildings and administrators but leave students and faculty you will have the university — sans conveniences to be sure, but still the essential university.

2. Another deeply disturbing aspect of this recent decision regarding the Russian department is the underlying assumption that a course of study is properly retained or eliminated solely on the basis of a certain quantum of student response. There are obviously courses of study or activity which belong in the university curriculum, whether or not they attract large numbers of students, if that university is going to deserve the name. Certainly Russian is one of them. It may be in a time of economic stringency that faculty members in larger departments will have to decide to sacrifice positions so that smaller but vital departments may survive, but in this case, the faculty of UCR was not even given the choice. Instead faculty was set against faculty. Administrators implied that it could just as well have been German as Russian, or History as Russian, and that the departments not decimated should consider themselves lucky. People who think and act this way do not belong in a college of humanistic studies; they belong in a cost accounting office, where their values are appropriate to the functions they perform.

3. The "Russian Department Affair" also illustrates the Administration's probable course of action in this time of austerity. They will first cut back on faculty; they will focus on relatively small departments; and they will eliminate recently appointed junior faculty members. Since new regulations from President Hitch's office have almost totally eliminated even the vestiges of job security at the junior professorial level, the administration probably can cut back here without serious repercussions from tenured staff or higher level assistant professors who — aware of their own precarious position — will avert their eyes and mutter, "there but for the grace of Golino go I."

As if to add injury to insult, on February 12 the Humanities College faculty received a memorandum from Dean Gleckner's office which claims (Item 3) that "no final decisions have been made either by me or the upper administration" regarding the "phasing out of programs or departments." Dean Gleckner insisted that his "recent discussions" were merely consultative and that program termination and initiation "are the prerogative of the faculty." The fact that every member of the German-Russian department consulted in the matter understood precisely the same thing — that Russian was to lose two positions and that the Russian major was terminated — has been attributed by Gleckner and Chancellor Golino to "misunderstanding" on the parts of those faculty members involved.

The truth of the matter is that the administration had arrogantly overlooked those faculty prerogatives Gleckner now so earnestly affirms, and only when a higher administrative official expressed concern and displeasure was the earlier decision reviewed. There was no misunderstanding at all. There were simply two different messages. One can only speculate what the administrative response would have been to faculty complaints had there been no disagreement on the heights of Olympus.

So long as the councils of the faculty are divided; so long as there is no solidarity of faculty committed to the whole university and to its preservation; so long as faculty refuse to recognize that power is the only thing administrators respond to — so long will we continue to be at the not-so-tender mercies of those very people whose only legitimate role is to serve faculty and students, but who now in the interests of self-preservation threaten every faculty member and even every department with excision.

By joining the United Professors of California you will be adding your individual strength to a group not hamstrung by administrative regulations, and able to articulate your demands for more equitable professional treatment as well as for a university embodying humanistic values. Size and unity of purpose mean power.

You junior faculty members, if you haven't yet read the new rules governing assistant professorial appointments, get a copy from your department chairman. Then get a union membership blank from Ron Mankau (Nematology) or Ron Chilcote (Political Science). It will help to take some of the chill out of your bones.

Alan Green,
Asst. Prof. of History

☆☆☆

Letter to the Governor

February 3, 1971

Governor Ronald Reagan
State Capitol Building
Sacramento, California

Dear Governor Reagan:

After reading newspaper accounts of your budget

Y 12 the
um from
no final

message, I simply had to write to congratulate you on your brilliant audacity in dealing with the University of California and its faculty.

For the past three years I have been astonished as you led the fight against salary and budgetary increases. I was sure that each time the faculty and administration of the University would find a weapon of counterassault: mass resignations; unionization; appeal to concerned pressure groups. But each time I looked in vain. The faculty was displaying the same courage and allegiance to principle that it had during the McCarthy era, and the administration — well, being an administrator yourself you knew what to expect from it.

In the meantime — absolutely dumfounding! — because of inflation faculty salaries were actually cut by 12% with nary a squeak! And now they are to be cut by another 6% AND at the same time their teaching load will be increased. As if that is not enough, you have administered the final coupe de grace (or is it the coup d'isgrace?), using a weapon right out of the armory of nineteenth century industrialism: you have threatened to bring in "unemployed professors" to replace those who are unwilling to take on added teaching burdens. "Scabs," right? Beautiful!

Who would have thought that the most innovative development in your career of public service would be to turn the state government into a corporation right out of the age of the Robber Barons? And with public money too! That has to be the greatest ploy since Teapot Dome.

But you are correct, of course, to think that this threat of "Scabs" will be sufficient to quell any restlessness among the academic natives — correct, that is, if precedent is any teacher. When asked by some "bleeding heart" professor, who is trying to support himself and a family of five on \$10,000 a year — and who already works sixty hours a week on teaching, course preparation, counseling and research — why you are doing this to him, you can say (along with the other "fittest" who will survive): "because I CAN, you son of a bitch." Isn't that so?

You know something, Governor, you may be an amateur in politics, but you sure do learn fast. I'm convinced that you're one of the smartest men around. Evil yes, but smart.

Sincerely,
Alan W. C. Green
Ass't Professor of History
University of California, Riverside

☆☆☆

TEACHING

Faculty Teaching Seminar

The faculty teaching seminar, which meets Tuesdays at 11:00 in Watkins 1327, invites participation from anyone interested. Discussions have gradually become increasingly experiential: people's specific experiments, problems and

successes are shared and criticized. From an initial phase of trying to lay out our theoretical framework — the goals for university teaching on which we could agree — we have moved to more specific topics such as feedback. The *Bulletin* will publish working papers as they evolve. The seminar has also sponsored, in conjunction with ASUCR, the showing of the film *REPORT*.

Roger Pierce

☆☆☆

Pedagogy in the University

The Bulletin intends to publish, from time to time, student views of the learning process in the University. The following was written by Micky Leh, a graduate student in Political Science, who previously was an undergraduate at UCR.

The following pedagogic concerns tend to overlap and reinforce one another. For purposes of definition, however, they will be treated as separate entities:

1. Critical thinking and self-evaluation — critical thinking refers to the cognitive processes of synthesis, analysis, and evaluation through which the learner deals with facts in order to reach a conclusion; self-evaluation applies critical thinking to the learner's own work and thoughts in order that he might assess himself according to criteria he considers important.

2. Self-motivation (self-direction) — the learner directs his studies toward areas he finds relevant; it refers to the pursuit of ideas and concepts having meaning to the learner rather than merely covering a pre-described body of information.

3. Community of learners — education being a dynamic and active process, learning is best facilitated in an atmosphere of equality, respect for ideas, and dialogue; learning derives from interaction using ideas having relevance for the learner, and therefore dialogue, rather than lecturing (one-way dialogue) needs to be fostered.

The above concerns are related primarily in their emphasis upon learner-centered education. As implied in the third concern, the first two concerns build upon one another and lead toward the third.

Turning to the university as presently constructed, I wish to sketch arguments against three practices: (1) lecture system, (2) grading, and (3) required courses. The lecture system creates passive education because it destroys the dialogue principle. At best a limited number of learners can engage in limited dialogue with the instructor. Inter-learner dialogue occurs only outside the confines of the classroom. Hence, the lecture system accentuates passive education. Lectures also undermine individual needs and relevancies for a mythical group need or relevancy. Hence, one finds that 50 - 80% of a class sits with bored expressions. These people are not having their needs met. Finally, lecturing meshes with the hierarchical nature of the university to create false divisions between members of the community.

One speaks of professors, undergraduates, graduates, assistant professors, et al. In fact, there is but one category of meaning: learner. This does not imply that all learners possess the same degree of sophistication regarding a specific subject matter. It does imply that all learners have worth and ideas which must be dealt with, and because of this, dialogue should be pursued.

Arguments against grading are many and generally well known. I wish to make only two points on this subject. First, grading undermines self-evaluative processes on the part of the learner when grades are imposed by another. Second, grades, rather than critical handling of ideas and concepts, becomes the driving force for the learner. A learner strives for a letter rather than a better understanding of subject material.

Despite the fact that most professors I have contact with abhor the grading system, I seriously doubt that it will soon be altered, let alone abolished. My apprehensions derive from the fact that throughout the educational system the fundamental concern remains control over the learners. In public schools (K-12), actual physical control of students dominates faculty thought; within the university it is control over the learners' academic activities. I sense a fear among faculty members and among some students that the elimination of grading would leave the university without any means of determining progress or competency. There is the further fear that if grades are eliminated, students will not study. If learning can only be coerced within the present educational structure — which is what the above fears imply — then the structure has condemned itself.

During the past four years, the university has reduced the number of required courses. I applaud this action. At the same time, however, restrictions have been placed upon 190's and studies which some term "political," as community field work. These actions I deplore. Learners need more freedom to direct their own studies and to determine areas of relevancy. If courses must continue, and if a set number of units remains the criterion for graduation, then begin a system of flexible uniting for courses. Rather than a four-unit course, provide the option of four to eight units per course depending upon what the learner decides to pursue in that course. Consider the "contract" system of determining credit, in which the learner and the instructor together determine the number of units a learner will receive upon completion of specified tasks.

Micky Leh

☆☆☆

REVIEW: Frederick S. Perls, *Gestalt Therapy Verbatim*. Real People Press, 1969.

This book is not directly about teaching at all — part of it is made up of lectures on Gestalt therapy (and the "elephantshit," as he calls it, of existential philosophy behind his practice), much of it is transcripts of Perls' therapy workshops. The implications for education are enormous. Perls is very much concerned with maturation,

which he defines as "the transcendence from environmental support to self-support." I should like to consider here briefly some of the consequences of seeing teachers as facilitators of this ripening.

Self-support is a process of full self-actualization, of full awareness both of ourselves and of our environment. Perls speculates that most of us live with five to fifteen percent of our potential — the rest is blocked off. Why? "We live in clichés. We live in patterned behavior. We are playing the same roles over and over again." Our potential for full life, on the other hand, "is based upon a very peculiar attitude: to live and review every second afresh."

The lesson for education is clear: predictability is highly sanctioned by our society — it makes us readily usable in our preplanned operations — and is therefore imposed on personal development by such social agents as teachers. Anyone who retains his capacity to see, and to respond freshly, moment by moment, becomes a locus of human power not so easily manipulated for ends not directly related to his own drive for self-actualization.

Perls points out that teachers, among other "socializing" agents, falsify our existence — our contact with reality — with two tools. One is anxiety, which Perls defines as "the gap between the now and the later" — it is the energy which has displaced itself from living out present potentialities, from dealing with reality, to absorption with the fantasy world of "catastrophic expectations."

We who operate the system know that anxiety rules our education, becoming increasingly intense at higher levels, as anyone who has leapt the successive hurdles leading to a Ph.D. can tell you. Grades, examinations, transcripts — the whole machinery of what we call "motivation" — stand between the student and the *experience* of his education, which has to happen *now* as he reads this book or pours those chemicals together, not at the end of the quarter or at the time he is applying for some well-paying job. Examination jitters — the anxiety which makes a fresh and joyful approach to the task impossible, is only a special instance of a consistent quality of our educational system.

The second tool of those who block contact with reality is, according to Perls, hypnosis — the self-consistent, polished intellectual performance, the lecture. "Right now I am hypnotizing you. I am hypnotizing you into believing what I say. I don't give you the chance to digest, to assimilate, to taste what I say. You hear from my voice that I try to cast a spell on you, to slip my 'wisdom' into your guts until you either assimilate it or puke, or feet it into your computer and say, 'that's an interesting concept.' Normally, as you know if you are students, you are only allowed to puke on the examination paper. You swallow all the information and you puke it up and you are free again and you have got a degree."

Perls distinguishes between understanding and explanation. Understanding is discovery, a closure, a completed experience: "Ahah! I got it! This is it!" Understanding is a step in maturation, a personal change. Explanation, the concern with concepts and information, is generally a process of manipulation. "Now it might sound a

bit peculiar
of role-play
we talk, but
other...

bit peculiar that I dis-esteem thinking, making it just a part of role-playing. Sometimes we might communicate when we talk, but most times we hypnotize. We hypnotize each other; we hypnotize ourselves that we are right. We play 'Madison Avenue' to convince other people and ourselves of our value."

Implicit in all of Perls' work and thought is his awareness of the other 85 - 95% of his clients' potentialities which are being held down. Perls is often very rough with people - the chair beside him was called the "hot seat" by those who work with him; he believes that frustration, and the overcoming of frustration by mobilization of ones own resources, is an essential aspect of growth. But a profound respect underlies his work. We in the University on the other hand, have evolved a system of "motivations" which seems to me to imply utter contempt for the student - he knows nothing, not even his desires and his interests, while we know everything, especially what is good for him. We ask the questions, we give the answers. We pretend that without ever knowing a student personally we can design a path of personal discoveries for him.

Our contempt is, of course, a self-fulfilling prophecy. The appropriate response to anxiety and hypnosis is not learning, growth or development, but counter-manipulation - the whining, excuses and con games that we know so well, all of which are forms of dependence. We teachers are aware of the tricks and dodges of student life, but not so aware that they are the counterpart of our own behavior. If we were to take more seriously our own learning experiences, and recall particularly the kind of self-direction that characterizes them, I think we might become less and less interested in teaching and more and more interested in providing the atmosphere in which learning can take place.

Roger Pierce

Asst. Professor of Theatre

☆☆☆

THE FACULTY UNION

Answer to the Chancellor

At a recent meeting with the faculty, Chancellor Hinderaker was asked what the reaction would be in Berkeley and Sacramento to a strong faculty union movement; his answer, not unexpectedly, was "disastrous." We would agree if the function of the union were simply a continuance of the hat-in-hand stance of the faculty, but collective bargaining is a way to speak with a different voice. A fine statement of some of the larger issues was made in November, 1970 by Mayor Robert Harris of Ann Arbor:

"I have been an employee most of my adult life but only became a member of management when I was elected mayor of a city employing 1,000 public employees. In some ways that has been the beginning of my education in employer - employee relations in the public sector. To oversimplify a bit, management views the labor force as an

expensive animal that should be kept as cheap as possible. The goal is to find ways to prevent unionization and to keep unions from driving wages up.

"My conclusion, as an employee - for I shall return to my former status as a University of Michigan teacher sooner or much sooner - is that employees must band together in unions and bargain hard collectively if they are to get their share of the growing gross national product. Relying on the management of public universities, cities, counties, etc. for fair wages is a mistake. Public management faces a penurious taxpaying public and can't make ends meet. Management is not interested in the fairness of wages, it is interested in keeping wages down, since there isn't enough tax revenue to do all that should be done and wage increases eat up the budget.

"I think it is essential that teachers - on all levels of organization - organize in unions and that these unions have the power to compel wage increases that keep pace with the rise of personal income in the private sector. Indeed, I know no other way in which teachers will see their income rise as fast as junior executives and blue-collar workers income is rising. In an age of continuing inflation, the failure of teachers to organize and bargain collectively, can only mean that they will subsidize other sectors of the economy as the other sectors get wage increases commensurate with inflation and the teachers do not.

"It is my impression that the university professor's income level relative to the income of those in other trades and professions was much higher in the 1920's and 1930's than it is today. I assume that the professor will continue to drop in relative income until he organizes and bargains collectively.

"This raises the question, 'Why haven't professors organized before?' I suspect the answer is vanity: the professor has not wanted to recognize the fact that in his relations with the top administrators and the state legislature he is just another wage employee like the maintenance crew. But since this is the fact, the professor had better swallow his vanity and pursue his economic self-interest. And that means collective bargaining through a regular trade union.

"I am a civil libertarian and hence must be concerned with the perennial problem of restrictions on the academic freedom of teaching personnel to teach and research without censorship based on opposition to particular views. The threat is ever present and has always been with us. I assume it always will be with us and we will do well to retain a meaningful chunk of academic freedom despite the endless mass pressures to impose censorship. Will unions help? My best guess is that unions can't hurt and may help. It is possible for union leadership to sell out idealism and join the witch-hunters, but this doesn't always happen. Often the union stands firm for its ideals or at least sides with the employee on the ground that every threat to job security is to be resisted by the union.

"What then of the argument that unionization will deprive the school of the power to fire incompetents? A

mix of answers. Incompetents can be fired from a unionized unit, although candor compels the admission that unions sometimes make discharge harder. But my experience is that even in non-union sectors it is frightfully hard to fire the incompetent. So the most that can be said, I believe, is that unionization will make it harder to weed out weak sisters.

"I have spoken, by and large, from the selfish perspective of the employee concerned about his future wage. Let me speak now about the public interest. I approach this problem much as I approach the problem of unions of police officers. I welcome the unionization of police officers, despite the obvious perils. I think that police officers, within the next five years, should see pay increases so that the starting salary is \$15,000. Were that the case we could be much fussier than we are now about who we will accept as an officer. And we would be more concerned than we are now about the training and retention of officers. Pay a man like a junior executive and you will screen and train him like a junior executive. Our hope for quality police is our ability to pay more money to police. And given current political realities, we will not pay big money to policemen unless their unions wring it out of the taxpayers.

"Similarly, our hope for quality teachers is in the unions: only if the unions force school management to pay top dollar for teaching talent will we attract top talent to the job. When I was in junior high, one of my best teachers quit to become a tombstone salesman. His action cast real light on how much our society is willing to pay to attract talent to teaching.

"Because I don't want my kids taught by mediocrities, I favor unionization of teaching personnel in the hope that teacher unions - on all levels, including college and university - will force up the relative wages of teachers and make it more attractive to our society's brightest, most responsible, and most creative people."

☆☆☆

Fringe Benefits to UPC Members

An automobile insurance plan costing 35% less than comparable "low cost" state employee programs is available

to members of the United Professors of California (AFT). This is only one of many money-saving insurance and service plans enjoyed by all UPC members wishing to participate.

Recently union members received a small booklet summarizing over a dozen "Special Services" to which they are entitled. A special Homeowners' and Tenants' Insurance Plan offers savings of up to 25% over specific policies, and Southern California members may subscribe to a Dental Care Program - especially good news to those of you with small children. Cut-rate mail-order drugs, including prescriptions, are also available.

Faculty union members will be particularly interested in low-rate sabbatical leave bonds and extremely low-priced charter flights, keyed into the academic schedule, flying to destinations all over the world. Discount buying privileges on automobiles (\$100 over dealer cost) and heavy appliances are also available.

Membership in your UPC local is not simply a matter of wages, hours and working conditions; it also means real and immediate benefits to you whose dollars buy less and less as cost of living increases pass you by. We're working on that too, but our strength depends on your membership. Join UPC today.

If you would like to talk over the union, call Ron Chilcote or Alan Green. If you would like to enroll, fill out the blank and send it to Ron with a month's dues.

Please enroll me as a member of the United Professors of California.

Name _____ Social Security No _____
Address _____ Dept. _____
Rank _____ Full Time _____ Part Time _____

| | | |
|-------|----------------|--------------|
| Dues: | Instructor - | \$5.00/month |
| | Asst. Prof. - | \$6.00 |
| | Assoc. Prof. - | \$9.00 |
| | Professor - | \$12.00 |

Please bill me: (circle one)

Quarterly Semi-annually Annually